

least questionable method of border security where people actually look at lines, and this happens, Mr. Speaker. People will actually view which line is being monitored, and this is coming across the border now, which line is being monitored by border patrol and which line is being monitored by any other agency. Customs in this case in particular, because of course Customs has certain regulations that they have to follow and Border Patrol has others. Border Patrol does not look in certain places where Customs will look. If you are trying to smuggle drugs in, you will come in via one line; and if you are smuggling people, you will come via the other. That happens. It is incredible, but it is true. It is because we have this mish-mash of responsibilities.

Trying to actually change all that, reform the system, this is our greatest opportunity, Mr. Speaker. This is the greatest opportunity we have ever had to reform immigration; but I fear that the lethargy, the inertia is so strong and the political obstacles to overcome are so great. We fear the political ramifications of immigration control, both Republicans and Democrats. Those ramifications are significant, but none more so than the potential safety of the Nation.

We have asked, this is our e-mail address and if Americans want to get in touch, we have encouraged them to write Tom.Tancredo@mail.house.gov for more information about immigration reform and for us to be in communication with people when there are important bills coming up in the Congress that they should be aware of and that we can request their help.

This is the only way that this will happen, the only way any of the reforms will be accomplished is if there is a huge outcry, to both Senate and Members of the House, to please, please do something more than just give lip service to immigration reform. Please develop true immigration reform proposals, put them in front of the President for him to sign.

We are going to be looking at one issue coming soon, and that is the extension of 245(i). The only thing we are going to do is perhaps extend amnesty for literally millions of people who are here illegally. That is going to be coming up on the House floor. Whether it is a part of the Commerce, State, Justice appropriations bill or a freestanding bill, that is what we are going to be asked to do, not throw out H-1Bs or diversity visas which give 55,000 visas to special countries because they do not send us enough people, many of those Middle Eastern countries, not to reduce or eliminate the number of immigrants coming into the country, not border security, not doing anything about truly trying to significantly change and improve immigration at INS by creating a new agency, entirely new agency. None of that.

What we are going to be asked to do is to extend, for the ability of people to

stay without going through the process of being reviewed in their country of origin so we will not know whether or not they have a criminal background or whether or not they are connected with any sort of agency that will bring harm to the United States. That is what we are going to be facing.

If people are willing to help us, we encourage them to go to that Web site, Tom.Tancredo@mail.house.gov. We need the help of everyone on this issue. It is the only way we will improve the whole procedure of immigration. It is the only way we will reform immigration and the only way we will be able to sleep easier at night, and that is what we are seeking here. It is far more important in my mind and in the mind of most people than who pays the salary, than the person who looks through the screening device at the airport.

TRIBUTE TO JERRY WILLIAMS AND REPRESENTATIVE BOB DORNAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHUSTER). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO) for his very excellent statement about the state of the country with respect to control of our borders and the important need to hesitate at this point in our history and put together a strategy that allows us to control our borders and to get a handle on immigration, and on all of the people who have come into this country legally but stayed beyond their legal limit and apparently did not care. I would hope to work with the gentleman and lots of others in the House over the next several months and try to get our arms around this important issue. I thank my colleague for his statement.

Mr. Speaker, on 9-14, just a couple of days after the tragic occurrence that we have been so focused on, a real American, a great Westerner, passed away. That gentleman was named Jerry Williams. I knew him as Mr. Williams because I had a lot of respect for him and for the legacy that he represented.

If one drives north from my district in San Diego and you go past Camp Pendleton, it is the only open area between San Diego and the greater Los Angeles area, and you proceed north, you can drive for hours without leaving the site of lots of pavement, lots of construction, lots of traffic and lots of people. That is the southern California that most Americans know. They see it on television. They see it in person when they fly into LAX or San Diego or any other metropolitan area in southern California.

But if one goes north and inland, one comes to a different California. It is a California of rolling foot hills, and I

am speaking of the Santa Barbara area, big oak trees draped with Spanish moss, and a legacy and a tradition of the Old West, a tradition that was started with the founding of the missions along the California coastline.

There are not a lot of great Western families left in southern California because we have urbanized enormously; but there are still a few, and Jerry Williams was one of those great Western ranchers. He represented a hospitality, a big heart, a sense of giving, a sense of community, that is now more rare in the West than it was 20 or 30 years ago.

I got to know him by knowing his sons, Rodney and J.P. Williams, and their families, and their good neighbor, John Wiester and his wonderful wife. The Santa Ynez Valley has a spirit of hospitality, just inland from Santa Barbara 15 or 20 miles with one coastal range between the valley and the Pacific Ocean.

President Ronald Reagan found that area to be the area that he wanted to locate in and he put his house on top of that mountain range about 10 miles or so from the Pacific Ocean.

But that was the world of Jerry Williams. He was a rancher. He was a farmer. He was a businessman extraordinaire. Jerry gave of himself to his community during his entire life. He and his wife, Nancy, lived in the Santa Ynez Valley for 40 years. Wild Turkeys flew overhead, and they had a pet raccoon or two. They had a wonder world for their grandchildren, and I could see this was a Western family that really cared about family.

Jerry Williams was a member of the Santa Barbara Cattlemen's Association; the Santa Barbara Fiesta Days is an event that we all remember. For 10 years he was a member of the board of that wonderful event until for the last 10 years he was the chairman of that particular board. This was a guy who represented a lot of California that many of us knew and loved and would like to see return. It is the California of graciousness and hospitality and goodness and people who make business deals by shaking your hand, not by bringing in a troop of lawyers. That was Jerry Williams.

Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to talk about Mr. Williams a little bit and to honor his legacy and the tradition that he has left in the California ranch country.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to talk about another individual. This individual is very much alive. I thought about him today as I was going through the New York Times and read the story about the defeat of Daniel Ortega, who at one time was the leader of communist Sandinistas in Nicaragua, and ran for president, and for the third time was defeated, this time by Enrique Balanos who is a businessman who was arrested a number of times, who always spoke out against the Sandinistas and had much of his property confiscated during the Contra wars.

This race was considered to be one that would go down to the wire. Mr.

Balanos won a fairly convincing victory, but it is not just the victory of Mr. Balanos over the former Sandinista leader that I think is impressive and reminds me of this other guy I am going to talk about; but it is the fact that there was an election, and it is the fact that there was a former communist leader running in that election, putting himself before the will of the people, before the electorate, to let them pass judgment of his fitness for judgment. That is the miracle of Central America and the miracle of the Reagan administration a lot of Members of what this House of Representatives and the other body did in the 1980s to bring about in a Central America that before was one in which military dictatorships were the order of the day, but to bring all of those military dictatorships, whether it was Nicaragua or Salvador or Guatemala, to bring those countries to become fragile democracies.

□ 2230

Obviously this democracy in Nicaragua has endured longer than many experts had predicted.

One of the gentlemen who really worked in those days to help this country win that freedom for Central America was a guy named Bob Dornan. Bob Dornan is a great friend of mine and a friend of many members of the House here. I see my good friend the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER) here, who stood side by side with Bob and myself and many others during the Contra wars.

He was a great friend of ours. And because his election was so close and was contested for so long, we never had a chance to sit around or to gather on the House floor as we often do when a Member retires or leaves office pursuant to an election and talk about that Member. We have not had that opportunity. We never did that, because that election was contested for such a long time that we never went through that tradition.

And so I just wanted to say a word or two today and invite my good friend, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER) to say a few words about this guy Bob Dornan.

I am reminded when our troops were killed in Somalia, when the American Rangers were killed and we had that crisis, that Bob Dornan was the one member of the House Armed Services Committee who flew for a dozen hours by himself to go to that location, to meet with the survivors and then came back and personally talked with the families of every American who had given his life in that particular mission, that very dangerous mission. That was Bob Dornan.

Bob Dornan knew every aircraft that was ever made in this country and a few that were made in other countries. He flew everything. He flew every jet aircraft and every bomber and every recon plane that we had. But it was really the people that he loved the most.

He did a wonderful job as the chairman of the Personnel Subcommittee on the House Armed Services Committee, and he loved people so much and loved people who wore the uniform so much that he was the one guy you could count on to meet with families when there had been a tragedy, when there had been a firefight, when there had been a death, and talk to them about the value of their loved one to the United States of America. I will always remember Bob for that and remember him for his great expertise as a fighter pilot who knew the equipment that we were voting on in the committee and on the House floor.

Of course, everybody has their favorite Bob Dornan story, but I can tell you, he was one guy when I was a freshman as a candidate for the House Armed Services Committee back in 1980 and we had a lot of great Members like former colleague Dan Lungren and Pete McCloskey and Bill Lowery and lots of others who were well qualified, probably more qualified than me for that position, and Bob Dornan himself all running for that post.

Bob got up when we were about ready to take the vote and said, you know, there is one guy there who is an Army veteran from Vietnam who has got a district that is a military district and probably deserves this seat or needs this seat more than anybody else, and that is Duncan Hunter. I was as much shocked by that as all my other colleagues, but Bob Dornan, instead of voting for himself, voted for me and let me as a freshman have that particular seat. What a wonderful display of generosity and selflessness that represented. That was the true Bob Dornan and is the true Bob Dornan.

One great thing about him is Bob Dornan stays current with the affairs of the day. He is still in the media. He is doing lots of work now in radio. And so the people across the country still have the opportunity to listen to this guy and listen to that good conservative wisdom that he has displayed so often.

I would be happy to yield to my good colleague, the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman is right. This is a very good day for us to remember Bob Dornan, the day after Daniel Ortega has lost again in a free election in Nicaragua, because I have no doubt if it was not for Bob Dornan and a few stalwarts, and I was very proud to be at your side and at Bob's side during this time during the Cold War when very, very few people were up making the case for supporting the Nicaraguan resistance, Bob was there.

And now we have free elections in Nicaragua, but not only just Nicaragua. Had we not had those freedom fighters that we were supporting to fight the Sandinistas, we would have lost all of Central America. There would not have been a disintegration of the will of the Soviet Union's leader-

ship which happened during Afghanistan and Nicaragua. If they would have seen instead that the Communist forces were just making their way up Central America towards Mexico, you can bet they would have been emboldened rather than weakened as they were. That was an incredible fight.

Bob Dornan, he does not get the credit for it; you are right. People look back right now, they are not going to give Bob Dornan credit for that, but I have no doubt that if it was not for the strength and the vigor and the energy and the excitement that he put into that, I do not think we would have won that. I can honestly look back and think that, because Bob was there 100 percent.

When he was with you, he was with you 100 percent. The Afghans know that. The Vietnamese who were fighting the Communist dictatorship knew that. People all over the world who were struggling against Communist oppression, he would just pop in on them, he would pop right in and say, "Hold firm, we're going to be with you. Don't worry about it. We're with you right now. What can we do?" He would get right in the action.

We have a cloakroom back here where the Republicans sit. Bob Dornan would sit there for hours telling us about these various personalities that he had worked with that love America, that need our help and were in a very precarious situation. Or he would be telling us about a new weapons system, because not only was he for strengthening those people who were struggling against the Soviet Union, he was for bolstering the strength of the ultimate freedom fighters, and those ultimate freedom fighters are the ones who wear the uniform of the United States of America, because he knew that our freedom fighters, the people in the United States military, had been done a great wrong, especially during the 1970s when we permitted their strength to be so drained that they were at risk. Their own lives were at risk, not only was our country at risk. Bob would talk about that.

I remember him talking about the food stamps that these kids in our military had to be on at the time. Bob was there not only for the freedom fighters overseas but he was for our freedom fighters as well.

When I was in the White House, and I was in the White House during most of the 1980s, Bob had had his ups and downs. I do not know if he remembers, but when he was on a down time one time in his career, I think he had given up his seat for somebody else, I think that is what it was, he ended up making my office sort of his command center. He took over my desk and, sure enough, he was right at home there.

Mr. HUNTER. That is true. Bob Dornan never had an office. He always had a command center.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. He certainly did. I was looking back in my photos

the other day. Sure enough, there we were.

Which leads me to another thing about Bob. Bob really worked his heart and soul out for Ronald Reagan, and he worked his heart and soul out for George Bush, Sr. Let us all admit, Bob became people mad, we all know that. He got people angry because he is an Irishman who has got a temper. We all know that. But Bob never got the appreciation that he deserved for the things that he did.

I know George Bush, Sr., he worked a full year trying to make sure that man became President of the United States. Then when Bob was down and out, as I say, he was there during the Reagan years, and it was not President Reagan, it was his staff, they did not do right by Bob.

Mr. HUNTER. That is true. Bob Dornan, I think, went to more States for George Bush than anybody else.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Than George Bush did, I am sure.

Mr. HUNTER. Except George Bush.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. I bet he went to more States than George Bush did.

Mr. HUNTER. You are probably right; he probably did.

We have all seen that the great thing about great Republican Presidents is you continue to love them even when their bureaucracy sometimes does not measure up to their measure of goodness. I think Bob understands that. I think we all have to deal with that on a day-to-day basis.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. If the gentleman will yield further, as I get older, I realize that all of us, every single one of us, has our good traits and our bad traits. We have things that are very admirable and other parts of us that perhaps are not as admirable. Sometimes, because Bob had such a temper, it blinded some people to the very good things that he was doing.

I know many times in technology development issues, most people think of me now because I am so involved with this Afghan thing that they think of me as the Afghanistan guy or the international relations guy, but actually I have spent a lot of time on technology issues in the Science Committee. I am the chairman of Space and Aeronautics.

Whenever we would be in a tight spot and we needed to make sure that a critical piece of technology for America's space program that perhaps had dual use for our military as well, we would go to Bob and Bob would make sure it got done. I can think of two or three times where it was so important and Bob made sure he did it. He took the time and energy to buttonhole the appropriator and make sure that he understood the magnitude of the decision of how much money was going to be spent developing a piece of technology.

Mr. HUNTER. That is true. I think one reason Bob was so helpful on aerospace issues and on military issues and was so good to this House and such a leader in the House is that Bob Dornan

loved and appreciated American air power.

Somebody mentioned the other day that American troops had not been killed by foreign air power, that is, by an adversary's air power, for something like 40 years. That is the period of time during which we have held total mastery of the skies in all the engagements that we have been involved in.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. That did not just happen.

Mr. HUNTER. It did not just happen. It is a function of a lot of great expertise, leadership and technology, and guys in the House of Representatives like Bob Dornan. Bob was one of a kind in supporting that continued superiority of air power.

You have got to have a good old Irish temper if you are an Irishman. I think that is one of the great things about Bob Dornan. When you were in a tight spot, you just wanted Bob to get angry at your adversary and you were taken care of.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. That is correct. I should say, if you are not getting people mad at you, perhaps you are not doing your job if you are a Congressman.

But sometimes, I have to admit, Bob lost his temper. But I will say this about Bob, and he does not like it when I say this, he has a temper; but you can see through the temper and you know that he has, he had and has, a wonderful heart. He has a heart of gold. He hates me to use that expression, for whatever reason, but I think he does have a heart of gold. He had a lot of passion in him. He cared a lot. That can get you in trouble sometimes.

With his own constituents, I know sometimes the news media would just take a picture when he had lost his temper about something. I will just have to say that I think it is, again when you say when someone is not appreciated, I think it is wrong what happened to Bob in the end in this body, what happened in the end here, we permitted, and I know that you worked a lot on this and so did I, but the rest of our Members did not.

Bob Dornan did not lose his election. That last election that he had was stolen with the use of illegal immigrant votes. Everybody here knows it and every now and then when you try to confront people with it, they will pull you aside and say something, oh, well, Bob Dornan, he flies off the handle and does this or that.

No, Bob Dornan won his election and his opponent in that election, or maybe not his opponent, maybe it was just his opponent's campaign team, who knows whether his opponent knew about it personally or not, but I can just say that clearly it was illegal alien votes that made the margin of victory. We should never have let that stand. When we let that stand, we did ourselves a disservice and we did Bob Dornan a disservice.

Mr. HUNTER. My colleague is absolutely right. Bob Dornan won the ma-

jority of the legal votes cast in that particular race. It is sad that so many officeholders who were in a position to do something about that, to pursue the investigation, became intimidated and allowed that thing to fall through. That happened throughout the State of California. Folks that were supposed to be subpoenaed left and went to other countries.

In the end the race card was played by the opponents of Mr. Dornan's campaign. That is sad, because everybody, regardless of your ethnic background or your religious background, everybody has got a stake in free and fair and honest elections. Bob Dornan got the majority of the votes in that election.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. The gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDI) was here a few moments ago talking to us about how illegal immigration has gotten so totally out of control. There is no doubt about this. Again he mentioned the fellow who was just caught up at O'Hare in Chicago trying to smuggle the knives and the stun gun onto an airplane. That is a horrible thing no matter who was doing it, but that person was here illegally. He was an illegal immigrant into our country. Not only should he have been arrested, of course, for trying to smuggle these weapons onto the airplane, he should never have been here at all.

□ 2245

I think that it was during this time period when Bob's election was stolen from him and other people backed away that the message went out that government was not going to do anything about illegal immigration. We would even let one of our own Members have his House seat taken by a margin created by illegal alien votes. So I think that was a bad disservice for Bob, it sent a very bad message to the country, and we should regret it in many ways right now.

Mr. HUNTER. There is one other area that Bob was very concerned about, and I think most Americans today, especially in the wake of the September 11 attacks are concerned, and that is the problem that we have, and the problem is that we have no defense against incoming ballistic missiles.

The argument against having a defense against missiles has always been that somehow it is unthinkable, it is unimaginable, that cities in the United States could be attacked by incoming missiles. It is not that there are not dozens of countries around the world making these missiles, and I would just hold up this chart to show the dozens of countries. Each one of these lines and boxes represents ballistic missiles that are being developed by various individual countries around the world. It is not that dozens of countries are not making these missiles, which are becoming increasingly capable of covering large distances, meaning a number of them can now reach the United States from various locations around

the world. But it was somehow that it was too Buck Rogerish to imagine a missile attack on the United States.

Remember when we first started talking about missile defense, and Ronald Reagan started talking about it in 1980, the put-down, and in politics you always try to get, whether you are conservative or liberal, you use a put-down with a touch of humor, and the put-down was this was Star Wars; that this was somehow so unimaginable that we would have an incoming missile hit an American city, that it was something that was more appropriate for a movie screen, where people would go and leave the real world for a few hours and watch a movie, than in real life. So that was a derision that a lot of journalists accorded the idea you should defend yourself against incoming missiles.

Of course, we defended ourselves against every other invention of warfare in this century. We defended ourselves against tanks; we came up with counter measures. We defended ourselves against machine guns. We defended ourselves against aircraft. We learned how to make radar to shoot down aircraft. When our own aircraft were shot down with radar, culminating in hundreds of planes being shot down in the Vietnam theater, we developed an airplane that could avoid radar, that at some places could not be seen by radar, the so-called stealth airplane. So every time there has been a technology that could defeat America's military developed by another country, we always built a countertechnology to defend ourselves.

For the first time in this century, in fact, in our history, we had people saying we should not defend against incoming ballistic missiles. Of course, we made the treaty with the Soviet Union where we promised not to defend ourselves, they promised not to defend themselves, and the idea was no matter who threw the first rock or missile, there would be such a huge response from the other side that both sides could be assured of destruction. That was called the MAD doctrine, mutually assured destruction. To a large degree, we still operate under that with the Soviet Union. We still have no defense against incoming missiles.

But today there are lots of countries, dozens of countries, who never signed that agreement not to defend themselves, or not to attack an America that did not defend itself, building ballistic missiles around the world. So right now President Bush is meeting with President Putin of Russia, and they are both acknowledging the reality that while we have made this agreement between our two countries for better or for worse, there are lots of countries that never signed the agreement who are building these systems with increasing capability to go further and further; and a number of these missiles can now reach the United States of America.

Mr. ROHRBACHER. If the gentleman would yield, I think it is some-

times mind-boggling to be here and to just understand that there are people who will permit something that is so horrendous a threat to the United States of America and just brush it off, just not even think about it, just sweep their hand as if it is not an issue because it is so stupid even to consider it.

There is an arrogance, a personality of arrogance in some of these debates that are overwhelming. Whether it is illegal immigration, where clearly, I mean, millions of people coming in, are bound to have a terrible impact on us in some way; or, I might add, during the last 8 years when I was up giving speeches trying to convince people we could not permit Afghanistan to go the way it was. Just the last administration, the Clinton administration, I might add, some of them, my fellow Members of my Committee on International Relations, just brushed it away as if I was being delusional or something, by suggesting that the last administration was actually having policies that helped the Taliban.

Then missile defense, based, as Ronald Reagan said, on an immoral theory. The immoral theory is we should kill millions of innocent people because our innocent people have been killed. That is an immoral theory. We should have MAD, mutually assured destruction. We are not just destroying their military capabilities. It is based on the idea we are going to slaughter tens of millions, if not hundreds of millions, of women and children.

Now, that is an immoral premise. That is what MAD, that strategy leaves us with. Having a defense system, as Ronald Reagan said, is a moral decision, is a moral stance facing this type of challenge. Instead of saying we are going to kill all of your women and children, you are saying no, we are going to defend ourselves.

Mr. HUNTER. Another thing has happened since September 11, and that is a lot of Americans realize there are people in the world who do not care about mutual assured destruction; and there are people who have technology, who understand how to leverage technology. Today the experts call it asymmetric warfare, that is, you do something that has a great deal of leverage and damage capability, far beyond the parity or the proportionality of your military to the other military. That is, you may have a very small military that could not in a conventional war take on the United States of America; but if you can use a technological weapon, and that includes today missiles, you can do a lot of damage, far beyond your size.

So I think since September 11 it is no longer unimaginable that one of these thousands of missiles that are now being built by our adversaries may in fact be used by them at some point. In fact, with all the construction of ballistic missiles that is taking place right now, it would be the first time in our history that all this construction and development and technology dol-

lars went into a program and it was never utilized.

When we saw technology go into the building and development of tanks, they used tanks. When we saw building and technology development go into the development of machine guns, they used them. The same thing with aircraft and artillery. So the idea that the bad guys are building these missiles but they do not intend to ever use them is itself a myth. I think it is becoming harder and harder to explain why we are not building defenses against missiles.

Finally, we now have a lot of Americans who were killed in that Desert Storm attack with Saddam Hussein's Scud missiles, that killed Americans; and we saw for the first time on the battlefield American casualties caused by ballistic missiles. We sent up our Patriot missiles to try to intercept them. The Army thinks they got about 80 percent hits. We had some private experts from the outside that said they did not think we got any hits. Probably the truth is somewhere in between. But right now we have more capability to knock down those Scud missiles.

Mr. ROHRBACHER. The phoniest argument against missile defense that I know is that we should not build it because it will never work. Well, who would advocate building a system that does not work? If it does not work, it will not be built. The fact is that no one on this side of the aisle or either side of the aisle who believes in missile defense would ever consider building a system that did not work.

But the major decision we have to make is if we can build a system that works, should we build it? And those people who are opposing the missile defense system, they do not want to face that argument. They just want to say it will not work, and, then, again, brush it away in an arrogant manner.

Mr. HUNTER. That is the offering that George Bush, President Bush, is making to the American people with this defense budget. He is requesting the dollars to expand our missile testing range, which presently is in the Pacific. We fire our missiles now, our test missiles, out of Vandenberg. We fire them due west. They cross over Hawaii at about 148 miles above the Earth's surface. And we fire an interceptor missile from Kwajalein Island at that incoming target missile. When they hit, they are both going about three times the speed of a 30.06 bullet.

The last test we did a couple of months ago it was a success, although it was an easier test. We had a transponder part-time in the missile going out. We shot that same shot a number of times, because we have a very limited test range.

So what President Bush has offered to all Members, whether you are for missile defense or against missile defense, is to do some really tough testing. He has said, and General Kadish, who heads up the Ballistic Missile Defense Office, said was, okay, let us do

some tough testing. The critics want it; they say this is too easy. Let us have some tough angles. You shot that pheasant going straight away. Have angles where they cross. Let us have some higher speeds; let us have some difficult geometries. Let us have some more difficult radar acquisition.

To do all of that, you have got to build a bigger test range. You cannot just have this narrow alley where you throw the same target up in the same position every time and you shoot it from the same position.

So we are now expanding this test range in this defense bill to Alaska, to a location at Fort Greely and a location at Kodiak, Alaska. So we are now going to have some very difficult shots.

It will also allow us to shoot-look-shoot. We will have multiple engagements. We throw up a missile, and if we miss it with first shot, we will try to get it with a second one. So we will have a chance to evaluate our success just seconds after we fired our first intercept; and, if we miss that intercept, we come back with a second intercept.

So President Bush has taken the challenge from all the naysayers that you talked about that said it does not work. A lot of the naysayers say we do not even want to test it. It is so unthinkable, we do not want to test it. That is no longer a reasonable position. That is why we need every penny of funding that the President has requested in this defense bill for missile defense.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. I think what we also to have understand, if the President is successful in his strategy, missile defense will actually in the end cost us less, much less, than what President Reagan envisioned missile defense costing, because if President George W. Bush is successful, we will be working with the Russians, as Ronald Reagan had suggested we might do in a more peaceful world; and we could actually work with the Russians to build this shield. It would help bring down the cost. This is something that would make the world a lot safer.

But for us to just suggest that no country, that we could rely on this mutually assured destruction, which was a policy from the 1950s and 1960s, is so ridiculous. China or Korea, for example, you have regimes that murder their own people by the tens of thousands. Why do they care then if we would retaliate against them and kill 100,000 or 200,000 of their people? They do not care. That does not deter them at all.

Mr. HUNTER. We just had an attack by people who did not care about mutually assured destruction.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Absolutely. I would like to thank the gentleman for, number one, his leadership, and also for helping us recall that Bob Dornan played such an important role on issues like this and other defense issues that have made the country safer.

I am pleased to be standing here at your side now, and wish Bob a lot of

success in his radio program that he has on, I guess, on a daily basis.

Mr. HUNTER. I want to thank my good friend for his contribution to this Special Order. I think it is appropriate that we started in southern California talking about Jerry Williams, who was a great cattleman and really carried forth a tradition and legacy of the West in his home and with his great family up in the Santa Ynez Valley where Ronald Reagan settled, and where you and I and Bob Dornan campaigned a number of times.

That was really, to some degree, the heart of the political movement that supported then Governor Reagan through a couple of campaigns for the U.S. Presidency and ended up with leadership in the 1980s that proved the validity of peace through strength. That is the idea that we in the United States would become so strong that we would be able to deter aggression. That means we could not only protect ourselves, but we could protect lots of others.

□ 2300

We did a lot of great things for the world. We freed a lot of people. This little article from the New York Times about the President or the head of the Communist Sandinistas, former dictator of Nicaragua, being beaten in a free and fair election in Nicaragua is great evidence of the validity of the idea of peace through strength that we engendered in the 1980s.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, let us note that for the record, I noted about a week ago on the Los Angeles Times editorial page, they had some leftist, as they always do, lamenting about Latin America and how horrible it was, this war in Latin America in which we stopped the Communists from taking over Latin America, and yes, it was certainly an imperfect war, and there never was a perfect war; innocent people were hurt and there were some unsavory characters on our side at times. But I say to the gentleman, there would be no democracy there; all of these countries would be like North Korea.

Mr. HUNTER. Or Cuba.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Or Cuba, if we would have lost then, but here we have in the L.A. Times, giving column inch after column inch to these old leftists who are proven wrong every time, and here again we have an election in Nicaragua where the people soundly reject everything this leftist was claiming about Latin America, everything he was claiming about Nicaragua, and the people down there do not believe a darned word of it.

But guess what? Guess what? The L.A. Times gives people like that all of that coverage, and they would not say a good word about Bob Dornan in his entire career. The L.A. Times would not give him one column inch. Detractors, yes. People who were espousing the virtues of the Sandinistas and

these people who would have enslaved the people of Latin America, the Communists, they get all of the space they need. Bob Dornan has never gotten a column inch.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, that is true. Daniel Ortega is probably sitting in an empty room right now in Nicaragua with an old copy of the Los Angeles Times predicting that he was going to win this election in one hand, and a "Dear Commandante" letter from the more liberal Members of this House of Representatives in the other hand, assuring him of his primacy. That is all he has left.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is correct.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for participating. Mr. Speaker, God bless the family of Jerry Williams, God bless Bob Dornan and his family, and God bless Ronald Reagan and his family and the strength that he brought to our country.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Ms. LOFGREN (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today and the balance of the week on account of a death in the family.

Mr. McNULTY (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today on account of personal reasons.

Mr. UNDERWOOD (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today on account of official business.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today and the balance of the week on account of illness in the family.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Ms. WOOLSEY) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. BONIOR, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. NORTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. STUPAK, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. LIPINSKI, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SCHIFF, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MORAN of Kansas) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. MORAN of Kansas, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HORN, for 5 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to: